

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1 and 7-9 have been amended.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 15, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,473,807 to Hills et al.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,473,807 to Hills et al. and further in view of "Official Notice."

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,473,807 to Hills et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,341,289 to Burroughs et al.

Claims 7, 11, 13, 17-19 and 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of admissions in the specification of the application at issue, at pages 1-2.

Claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of admissions in the specification of the application at issue, at pages 1-2, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,473,807 to Hills et al.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of admissions in the specification of the application at issue, at pages 1-2, and further in view of "Official Notice."

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of admissions in the specification of the application at issue, at pages 1-2, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,341,289 to Burroughs et al.

The drawings stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5). As per the requirements of the office action, applicants have amended the specification in order to add the reference signs in the description.

Reconsideration of the Office Action of October 27, 2003 is respectfully requested in view of this response.

**Amendments to claims 1 and 7-9**

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the OLE DB interface for communicating with a client application receives a command from the client; that the first command parser parses the command; and that the second command parser parses at least a portion of the command. No new matter has been added by this amendment. The amendment finds support in at least page 7, line 29, through page 9, line 10. Claim 7 has been amended to include claim limitations from Claims 8 and 9, which have been amended to remove those claim limitations which have been added to claim 7. Support for this amendment is found in original claims 8 and 9, and in the specification at page 7, line 29, through page 9, line 22.

**Claims 14-16**

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. Based on this rejection, claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine in combination with another U.S. Patent. Applicants respectfully disagree with, and traverse, the stated grounds for rejection. As described below, the claims recite various features that are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art. Applicants thus submit that all of the claims are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record.

Below, applicants discuss various claim features that define over the prior art of record.

*“one or more second parsing means for parsing at least a second portion of the data request or command”*

Claim 14 is directed towards a versioning system and calls for, among other claim elements, (a) first parsing means for parsing at least a first portion of a data request or command; and (b) one or more second parsing means for parsing at least a second portion of the data request or command.

In other words, claim 14 calls for a versioning system in which two parsing means exist for parsing at least a first portion of a data request or command, and at least a second portion of a data request or command, respectively.

Applicants respectfully maintain that the Pouschine reference cited by the examiner does not teach this feature. The examiner contends that the first parsing means is found in parser 122 of Pouschine. The examiner further contends that the second parsing means is found in calculation engine 18 of Pouschine. Applicants respectfully disagree, for the following reasons.

While applicants' invention is directed to a versioning system, Pouschine deals with a distributed on-line analytical processor (DOLAP) and its use in multi-dimensional analysis of data. Such data is predominantly stored in relational data base management systems (RDBMS). See Pouschine, column 8, lines 50-56.

In Pouschine, calculation engine 18 never is said to perform any parsing of a request or command. The calculation engine 18 of Pouschine "handles the retrieval and caching of data and computation of cell values for the model." Pouschine, column 8, lines 65-66. The calculation engine 18 in Pouschine uses information to determine, from a number of tables, which table to access to get data for a specific model. Pouschine, column 14, lines 57-60. Pouschine further states that the calculation engine 18 retrieves data from one or more databases, caches data, and computes values for the model. Pouschine column 15, lines 33-39. In these broad descriptions of the function of the calculation engine, no parsing is described as being performed by the calculation engine 18.

The parser 122 in Pouschine does convert a query 202 to a query component tree, the calculation engine 18 receives only a query component tree 204 which is the result of the parser 122's conversion. Pouschine, column 16, lines 23 through 27. The calculation engine 18 also takes rules provided by the Domain Modeling Rule Set Preparation 208 from the model metadata 206 and inserts them into the query component tree 204. Pouschine, column 16, lines 27-33. However, Pouschine neither teaches nor suggests that the calculation engine 18 performs any parsing on the query 202 or the component parts of the query contained in query component tree 204. The only indication that the calculation engine 18 performs parsing is the inclusion of parser 122 in the calculation engine 18 in Figure 7 of Pouschine. However, this only tends to show that, even if calculation engine 18 is seen as containing a

parsing means, that means is the same as parser 122 (which the Examiner analogized to the first parsing means). No second parsing means is taught or suggested in Pouschine.

In contrast, in the claimed invention, a second parsing means parses at least a second portion of a data request or command, where at least a first portion of the data request or command has been parsed by a first parsing means. Therefore, Pouschine does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 14, and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,473,807 to Hills et al. The logic for this rejection is based on the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection of claim 14, and therefore the remarks and arguments above apply to distinguish these claims from the teachings of the prior art.

#### **Claims 1-6**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,473,807 to Hills et al. Based on this rejection, claims 2, 4, and 6 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the same art. In addition, based on this rejection, claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,473,807 to Hills et al. and further in view of "Official Notice;" and claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,473,807 to Hills et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,341,289 to Burroughs et al.

Applicants respectfully disagree with, and traverse, the stated grounds for rejection. As described below, the claims recite various features that are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art. Applicants thus submit that all of the claims are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record. Below, applicants discuss various claim features that define over the prior art of record.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed towards an architecture for a versioning application program interface and calls for

- *an OLE DB interface for communicating with a client application, said interface receiving a command from said client application;*

- *a first command parser operatively coupled to the OLE DB interface, said first command parser parsing said command;*  
- *a command dispatcher operatively coupled to the first command parser; and*  
- *one or more protocol providers operatively couplable to the command dispatcher, with each protocol provider including a second command parser, each of said second command parsers parsing at least a portion of said command.*

*"OLE DB interface for communicating with a client, said interface receiving a command from said client application"*

The Examiner has found the OLE DB interface is taught in Pouschine by the OLE-style API provided by the OLE API 42 (Pouschine, col. 9, lines 41-46), and that the client application is taught in Pouschine by DOLAP Client App 40. However, there is no indication in Pouschine that the OLE API 42 receives commands, that, if it does, such commands are received from DOLAP Client App 40. To the contrary, Pouschine teaches that DOLAP Client App 40 interfaces with C API 38, while OLE API 44 is used to interface with third party tools 44. (Pouschine, Figure 7, column 9, lines 30-46).

*"one or more protocol providers operatively couplable to the command dispatcher, with each protocol provider including a second command parser, each of said second command parsers parsing at least a portion of said command"*

As discussed above, no second parser is found in the Pouschine reference. The Examiner has found that the second command parser in the one or more protocol providers is taught by the ODBC invocation program in the Hills patent. However there is no indication in Hills that any prior parsing of commands is done before the ODBC invocation program's parsing. In fact, Hills teaches that "The NT server forwards client requests for data (including ODBC queries) to the transactional processing system" where "the request is parsed by the ODBC invocation program." Hills, column 5, lines 55-62. These requests have not been previously parsed in Hills.

While both Pouschine and Hills includes the parsing of a query, there is no indication in either Pouschine or Hills that the same command or query is parsed twice, nor is there any indication that the purpose of the parsing is different in Pouschine and Hills. There is no

indication in Hills that the ODBC invocation program is operatively couplable to a command dispatcher such as the dispatcher 120 in Pouschine, nor any indication that the ODBC invocation program is operatively coupled to anything (such the command dispatcher in claim 1 of the application) which is operatively coupled to a first command parser. Thus it can not be said that the ODBC invocation program in Hills, can be combined with the teachings of Pouschine, to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,473,807 to Hills et al. (claims 2, 4, and 6) additionally in view of "Official Notice" (claim 3) and of U.S. Patent 6,341,289 to Burroughs et al. (claim 5). The logic for these rejections are based on the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claim 1, and therefore the remarks and arguments above apply to distinguish these claims from the teachings of the prior art.

#### **Claims 7-13**

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of the admitted prior art. Based on this rejection, claims 11 and 13 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the same art. In addition, based on this rejection, claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (further in view of U.S. Patent 6,473,807 to Hills et al.;) claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (further in view of "Official Notice;") and claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) (further in view of U.S. Patent 6,341,289 to Burroughs et al.)

Applicants respectfully disagree with, and traverse, the stated grounds for rejection. As described below, the claims recite various features that are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art. Applicants thus submit that all of the claims are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record. Below, applicants discuss various claim features that define over the prior art of record.

Claim 7, as amended, is directed towards an architecture for a versioning application program interface, comprising:

- an interface for communicating with a client application;

- a command dispatcher for dispatching commands or requests from the client application;
- a first command parser for parsing at least a first portion of a request or command from the client application;
- two or more versioning protocol providers operatively couplable to the command dispatcher, with each versioning protocol provider for communicating with a at least one corresponding version store; and
- *two or more second command parsers for parsing a second portion of the request or command from the client application.*

As discussed above with respect to claim 14, no second parsing means is found in Pouschine. The second parsing means is also not found in the admitted prior art. This amended claim 7 includes limitations found in original claims 8 and 9, which had been rejected in view of Pouschine, further in view of the admitted prior art, and further in view of Hills. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, no second parsing means is also not found in Pouschine in view of Hills. Similarly, the admitted prior art does not rectify this deficit in the combination of prior art that the examiner proposes. Thus, the limitations of amended claim 7 are not taught or suggested in the prior art.

With respect to claims 8 and 9, the examiner describes Hills as teaching two or more second command parsers for parsing a second portion of the request or command from the client application. Applicants respectfully disagree. Hills contains no such teaching. Only one parser, the ODBC invocation program, is ever discussed in Hills. Hills, column 5, lines 57-62. The additional limitations from claims 8 and 9, describing the association between second command parsers and versioning protocol providers is additionally not addressed by either Hills, the admitted prior art, or Pouschine. The examiner states that Hills teaches that each of the second command parsers are associated with only one of the versioning protocol providers, however, again, the applicants disagree. Even were this teaching found in Hills, it would not provide a teaching for the limitation of claim 9, which states that “*at least one of the second command parsers is capable of parsing commands from two or more of the versioning protocol providers.*”

In addition, based on the rejection of claim 7, claims 11 and 13 stand rejected. Based on the rejection, further in view of “Official Notice,” claim 10 stands rejected. Based on the

rejection, further in view U.S. Patent 6,341,289 to Burroughs et al., claim 12 stands rejected. The logic for these rejections are based on the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claim 7, and therefore the remarks and arguments above apply to distinguish these claims from the teachings of the prior art.

**Claims 17-19**

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of admissions in the specification of the application at issue, at pages 1-2. Claims 18 and 19 stand rejected as being unpatentable over the same art.

Applicants respectfully disagree with, and traverse, the stated grounds for rejection. As described below, the claims recite various features that are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art. Applicants thus submit that all of the claims are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record. Below, applicants discuss various claim features that define over the prior art of record.

Claim 17, as amended, is directed towards a method of operating a computer system including two or more version stores, comprising:

- receiving a request from a client application, with the request having at least first and second portions;
- parsing the first portion of the request;
- *parsing the second portion of the request based on results of parsing the first portion;*
- dispatching the parsed first and second portions of the request to one of the two or more version stores based on the first portion of the request.

As discussed above, with respect to claim 14, the calculation engine 18 of Pouschine does not teach a second parsing of a request. Therefore, for similar reasons, applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection of claim 17, which relies on calculation engine 18 to teach such second parsing.

Based on the rejection of claim 17, claims 18 and 19 stand rejected. The logic for these rejections are based on the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claim 17, and therefore the remarks and arguments above apply to distinguish these claims from the teachings of the



prior art. In addition, the examiner finds the limitation of claim 18, of "*parsing the second portion at the command parser associated with the one version store*" as occurring when data is sent to the calculation engine 18. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Pouschine that the calculation engine 18 is duplicated or associated with only one RDBMS (which the Examiner has found analogous to the version stores in the rejection of claim 17). This shows that the Examiner's reading of the teachings of the prior art cannot apply to the claimed invention in claim 18.

**Claims 20-24**

Claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,918,232 to Pouschine et al. in view of admissions in the specification of the application at issue, at pages 1-2.

Applicants respectfully disagree with, and traverse, the stated grounds for rejection. As described below, the claims recite various features that are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art. Applicants thus submit that all of the claims are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record. Below, applicants discuss various claim features that define over the prior art of record.

Pouschine is directed towards distributed on-line analytical processor (DOLAP) and its use in multi-dimensional analysis of data. See Pouschine, column 8, lines 50-56. It uses data stored in databases 16 in order to calculate values for a specific business model. Pouschine, column 8, lines 57-61. There is no teaching or suggestion in Pouschine that the databases could store versions of data. The data in databases 16 are combined according to the model 50 in order to provide the value of specified cells of the model. Pouschine, column 15, lines 33-39. There is no indication in Pouschine that alternate versions of the same data would be useful in a model.

With respect to claims 20-24, the Examiner argues that it would be obvious to replace the databases in Pouschine with versioned stores as discussed in the specification of the application because it is well known that RDBMS keeps updating data. However, there is no indication in Pouschine that any data other than a final version of data would be used in a model. Thus, the applicants contend, there is no motivation to combine the Pouschine

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-0563 / 144165.1

**PATENT**

**Application No.:** 09/717,587

**Office Action Dated:** August 13, 2003

reference with the idea of versioned storage. Applicants maintain that the section 103 rejection of claims 20-24 should be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that this case is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Date: March 23, 2004



---

Sharon Fenick

Registration No. 45,269

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439